DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 441 768 SP 039 224

AUTHOR Cole, Ardra L.
TITLE An Overview and Analysis of Processes of Programmatic and Curricular Reform in Teacher Education in Anglophone Canada.
SPONS AGENCY Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Ottawa (Ontario).
PUB DATE 2000-04-00
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Change Strategies; Communication Skills; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Leadership; *Preservice Teacher Education; Rewards
IDENTIFIERS *Canada; *Reform Efforts; Reform Strategies

ABSTRACT

This study examines the process of programmatic and curricular reform in teacher education at Anglophone universities across Canada. The first phase of research involved gathering preliminary information about how teacher education institutions were responding to calls for reform, gauging the nature and extent of these efforts and processes associated with their facilitation, and identifying perceived key obstacles and enablers of change. The analysis showed that the rhetoric of teacher education reform proliferates institutional policy documents, reports, and mandates, and the nature, scope, and substance of changes are divergent. Researchers identified five sites where substantial programmatic reform was underway. This paper examines some of the features, themes, and issues emerging from the case study explorations. It discusses the benefits of the change initiatives, focusing on: breaking the mold of leadership, acknowledging the complexity of change, finding necessary resources, developing coherence and building community, and communicating. It examines threats to change, focusing on change in leadership, sustainability of energy, sustainability of program change, characteristics of faculty and academic cultures, forces of tradition and identity, and the reward system. The paper concludes by examining the notion of goodness as an important lens through which to view teacher education reform. (Contains 23 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 441 768

An Overview and Analysis of Processes of Programmatic and Curricular Reform in Teacher Education in Anglophone Canada

Ardra L. Cole
Department of Adult Education,
Community Development and Counselling Psychology
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
of the University of Toronto
252 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario, M5S 1V6
Canada
Phone: (416) 923-6641 ext. 2497
Fax: (416) 926-4749
E-mail: acole@oise.utoronto.ca
Site: http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/~ardracole

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A. L. Cole
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented in symposium sponsored by the
Canadian Association of Teacher Education at the
Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association,
New Orleans, Louisiana, April 24-28, 2000

SP039224

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

An Overview and Analysis of Processes of Programmatic and Curricular Reform in Teacher Education in Anglophone Canada[1]

Ardra L. Cole

Calling for teacher education reform is not a new phenomenon, and proposals continue to abound; however, despite persistent efforts over several decades to effect change in teacher education, the way teachers are prepared in university-based teacher education programs in North America has basically remained unchanged for generations. This brings to mind the adage, *plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose* (the more things change superficially, the more they are fundamentally the same). There is no shortage of information about reform implementation in the USA and Canada. Numerous analyses exist of proposals and strategies for educational reform (see e.g., Blackwell, 1996; Bush, 1987; Clark, 1993; Cornbleth, 1986; Cuban, 1990; Fullan with Stiegelbauer, 1991; Holmes Group, 1995; Kettlewell, 1996; Portman, 1993; Sarason, 1990). For the most part, however, it seems that only lip service is paid to the idea of improving schools for students and teachers, and improving the ways in which teachers are prepared.

There are, however, small pockets of reform activity throughout North America as deans of education, or faculties as a whole or in clusters endeavour to reform their preparation programs. Such efforts stand out as anomalies in an otherwise static and conservative system of teacher education. These efforts typically are not well publicized and the complexities of the reform process are usually made known only in informal conversation; yet, it is these kinds of reform-minded efforts that merit exploration, description, and analysis.

---

[1] The research informing this paper was generously funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

The research informing this paper builds on the findings of an earlier study focused on the professional lives and experiences of pre-tenured teacher education faculty working towards reform in teacher education at a number of Canadian teacher education institutions (see Cole, 2000; Cole, Knowles, brown, & Buttignol, 1999). In brief, that research made evident the considerable dissonance underlying and determining the direction and articulation of the teacher education reform agenda in faculties of education; most apparent was the competing nature of the agenda of progressive, "reform-minded" teacher educators and conservative, "response-minded" teacher education institutions. Institutional forces that maintain the status quo overpower individual efforts to challenge and change convention, particularly when those individual efforts are made by the least powerful members of the academic community–untenured professors of teacher education. This revelation begged the question, How can substantial teacher education reform ever happen? In a current two-phased study I explore this question.

Background and Overview of Research

In the first phase of a current study of teacher education reform, I gathered and analysed information about teacher education reforms underway in faculties and departments of education in Anglophone universities across Canada (Cole, 1999). The broad purposes of this phase of the research were to gather preliminary information about how teacher education institutions are responding to calls for reform (either self- or other-motivated), to gauge the nature and extent of those efforts and the processes associated with their facilitation, and to identify perceived key obstacles and enablers of change. From the analysis it became clear that the rhetoric of teacher education reform proliferates institutional policy documents, reports, and mandates and the nature, scope, and substance of changes taking place are divergent. Changes range from staffing cuts or program closures to deep conceptual shifts in program orientation, design, and delivery. To quote Cornbleth (1986, p. 13),

however, "The present flurry of activity ought not to be mistaken for change", at least fundamental and substantive change.

For varied and complex reasons, most of the changes in teacher education underway in Canadian Anglophone universities can be characterised according to Clark Kerr's (1986) definition of "response-minded change"–a reaction to an externally imposed mandate or an internal effort perceived as a top-down initiative, the needs for which are unclear or unfelt. In a very few cases education faculties and departments are involved in a complete overhaul of their program's orientation, design, structure, curriculum, and delivery and in redefining the nature of the work that teacher educators do. Even though such changes might be externally mandated, the efforts seem consistent with Kerr's notion of "reform-minded changes"–change that is guided by a set of values. Because of the enormity of the commitment required to effect such substantive and systemic change and because, historically, such efforts are relatively rare it behooves us to observe, support, and learn from such efforts.

I identified five 'sites' where substantial programmatic reform is underway. I am now in the process of studying and analysing those initiatives using a case study framework (Merriam, 1988) situated within a life history perspective (Goodson, 1995; Cole & Knowles, forthcoming). These case studies of teacher education reform, which reveal a range of reform efforts in Anglophone Canadian teacher education institutions, will emerge as compelling, in-depth analyses of individual, institutional and programmatic change.

In this paper, I take a preliminary look at some of the features, themes, and issues emerging from the case study explorations. I am not reporting on individual programs nor presenting cases of change; instead, I am relying on the preliminary insights gained through an in-depth (and ongoing) investigation of a number of programs involved in substantive change in order to identify some broad features, themes, and issues. While each change effort is context- and people-dependent and,

therefore, unique, it is possible to make some observations of trends or features that cut across these change efforts. It is informative to delineate some of the common features or qualities, inherent in the various change efforts, that contribute to their 'goodness'. In other words, it is useful to ask the questions, "What is 'good' about these efforts? What good things can we learn from observing these processes of change"? My decision to look for goodness is informed by Sarah Lawrence-Lightfoot (1997, p. 142), who urges: "a shift of research stance–from focus on weakness to pursuit of strength, from preoccupation with disease to concern for health, from inquiry into dysfunction to examination of productivity". Such a focus, she goes on to say, does not ignore the negative attributes for they are always present: "In focusing on what works, on underscoring what is healthy and strong, we inevitably see the dark shadows of compromise, inhibition, and imperfection that distort the success and weaken the achievements" (p. 142).

In analyses of teacher education reform efforts there has been a proliferation of reports outlining why reform does not happen and, typically, such reports engender a resonant nod suggesting a level of recognition: "Yes, that's what happened in our Faculty when we tried to...". In contrast, reports of success stories often trigger a response such as, "Well, that might have worked there but we could never do that at our place". These kinds of responses–recognition of failure, refusal to accept the possibilities of success, and general resignation to the status quo–reveal much about who we are as teacher educators and the nature of the institutional contexts within which teacher education is situated and teacher educators work.

Because substantive reform is brought about (or not) by people moving within complex institutional contexts, change efforts inevitably have sides of both sunshine and shadow, which need to be seen in relation. Shadows are cast by sun. It is important to appreciate the influences of both. Following an overview of some of the rays of strength that help the various reform efforts shine, I will spend time in the "dark

shadows of compromise, inhibition, and imperfection" and discuss some of the issues and forces that threaten the continuing success of these efforts to substantively and systemically change teacher education and the work of education professors. They give us, as individuals and as a community, pause to reflect on who we are as teacher educators and faculty members, how we are and want to be in our workworlds and in our careers, what we want teacher education to look like and its place in the university, what is required for real change to take place, and what that might mean for everyone involved.

What is Good About These Change Initiatives?

It is well known that Education is a poor cousin in the university family. Since moving into the university from non-degree granting tertiary institutions, education faculties and departments have struggled for acceptance and legitimacy within the university system. For the most part they have gained little ground. They are still among the most poorly funded departments and faculties, have relatively little political clout, and have a poor reputation overall as a scholarly contributor to the university's status and standing.

The programs I have been studying have dramatically changed the profile of Education within their respective institutions from very poor to high and, in most cases, now stand as models of change for other faculties. Similarly, in their local and professional communities, the Education programs, particularly but not exclusively the teacher preparation programs, have gone from disregard to model regard. The changes are profound and amount to a complete overhaul of program orientation, design, structure, curriculum, delivery, and in some cases, faculty. Even though, in some cases, the very existence of the Education unit depended on a successful program overhaul, no one factor was responsible for the change taking place. As one person put it, "Several factors came together to act as a catalyst for the restructure of the Faculty and redesign of the teacher education program".

Considering the relatively short period of time in which these changes have been underway it is most impressive that the effects already have been so clearly felt. How has this happened? Aside from involving "a series of calculated risks", as one administrator summed up the facilitation of the change process, several more specific characteristics are noteworthy.

Breaking the Mold of Leadership

"Leadership is key to our [unit] being effective"–an understatement that speaks of each change effort underway. In every case of change a new leader (dean or department chair) with a strong commitment to change was appointed. Also, in every case, the newly appointed leader broke a mold of leadership cast in gender, age, seniority, administrative experience, leadership style, ideology, or commitment to teacher education. The administrators leading program innovation in teacher education share a passionate commitment to a vision for teacher education and to having that vision articulated. Such a vision is strongly supported by an explicit set of values and principles related to teacher education and to change processes which are enacted with incredible energy, dedication, and skill. Each is committed to developing a teacher education program that is unique, principled, and which stands apart in a particular way from other teacher education programs.

Each leader, in her or his own way, works tirelessly to facilitate and effect change. In most cases, this has meant a deliberately alternative approach to leadership in recognition of a need to counter the tradition continued by generations of administrators "interested in preserving status quo and keeping everyone happy". Even with a long standing recognition of the need for change, both within Education and the University, a history of no real incentive or motivation for change and a long line of change efforts that were variously stalled at both faculty and university level demanded a dramatically different approach to leadership. In some cases this meant adopting a non-negotiable stance to replace a more democratic method of decision

making attributed with maintaining status quo. As one faculty member commented, "If we had waited for consensus we would still be doing things the old way". In other cases, recognition that old ways of leadership were not effective meant shifting to a facilitation of a "communitarian ethic" where the unit "operates as a collective and is not bureaucratically structured", where "all take seriously the democratic process". It also meant that leaders had to challenge the tradition of slow moving, detail ridden change. As one commented, "Part of the reason things are so slow to change in universities is our tendency to sit around and overly conceptualize and analyze before acting on anything". Change needed to happen quickly and getting approval for program changes without waiting until all of the details were worked out was crucial; otherwise, as someone commented, "It would have remained another alternative program that would never be entirely worked out". Challenging conventional approaches to leadership also meant moving forward with a healthy dose of naive optimism, a fierce determination to "make it so", and an absolute refusal to believe that goals for change would not be achieved. This 'field (or garden) of dreams' mentality–"You plant the seeds and keep watering them. Eventually it is no surprise when the garden begins to appear; in fact it is expected"–is both inspirational and unusual in tradition- and rule-bound institutions like universities.

One of the most impressive observations, and a tribute to the integrity of these individuals as leaders, is how unanimous faculty and staff members are in their perception of their leadership qualities and skills. Regardless of whether individuals agreed with any or all aspects of the substance or process of change, if each were asked to create a profile of the administrator(s) leading the change efforts, the profiles would look remarkably similar.

Acknowledging Complexity of Change

The vision for change in teacher education articulated and supported by the unit administrators is based on an understanding and acknowledgement of the contextual

complexity of teacher education. In every case change efforts involved working at multiple levels within and outside the faculty or department, university, field, community, and government to 'educate' and advocate for teacher education. Concerted attempts were made to strengthen political connections outside the university with all major stakeholder groups. This included efforts to obtain external support for the revised program by inviting observers into the change process. Within the university, efforts were made to tie proposed program changes into the broader university vision/mission and to new strategic directions of the university. To create an immediate awareness of change in the community outside the university, there was a focus on establishing high visibility initiatives. While this was especially important for institutions located in smaller communities, it was deemed necessary in all cases to provide the many and varied constituents with some assurance of competence. It needed to be made clear that the new program would stand for something worthy of support and that the efforts were intended for long term growth and not just for short term survival.

Clearly, such arduous and time consuming work requires more than just vision and commitment. People make change happen (or not) and people and their work need various kinds of support. These leaders were highly strategic in their allocation of resources to support change and in marshalling the "right" people to help move efforts forward.

Resources

The financial, moral, and administrative support for change efforts, including a commitment of new resources, by a new University President, who was supportive of Education and of change, enabled or, in many cases, instigated the change efforts. In some cases, no new moneys were allocated to Education but a strong commitment of energy to seeking funds and other resources to support changes was made by the unit administrator/change leader. All of these institutions, like all others, continue to

face budget cuts; indeed, a dramatic reduction in faculty complement was a key impetus for change in some cases. And, as I will discuss later, the further dwindling of resources is a real threat to the sustainability of some programs. Ironically, though, in almost all cases budget cuts worked to facilitate change. These astute and optimistic leaders were able to turn budget cuts to their advantage when such reduction in financial resources translated into early retirement incentives for eligible faculty. This often meant that many faculty members, who were not supportive of change efforts or who had strongly opposing perspectives on their roles within the unit, were able to "gracefully exit". This significantly contributed to another of the strong features of these reform efforts–a focus on program coherence through community building.

Developing Coherence and Building Community

Without a doubt the success of these program reforms is attributable to the faculty involved. In most cases, the faculty most involved and most committed to teacher education, most willing to change, and most enthusiastic about the possibilities of change were newly hired, and usually early career academics. While this presents tremendous challenges and raises significant issues, which I will discuss later, the reality is that strategic hiring made possible much of what has happened in these institutions. Strategic positioning and involvement of other, more senior academics was also necessary to the reforms' success. The aim was to build cadres of like minds with a philosophical congruency and shared commitment to teacher education. Sometimes this meant that the unit leaders had to "creatively interpret" university hiring policies with respect to how particular, desired candidates 'fit' advertised position descriptions. In one case, in order to help relieve some of the demands on more junior faculty and to strengthen external support for the new program, the unit leader "bargained hard" with central administration of the university to hire some very high profile local and professional community members with strong

credibility and connections. Developing coherence and building community also meant, in one case, gaining 100% faculty approval and support for every new faculty member hired!

It was repeatedly suggested, in a couple of smaller institutions, that much of what has happened by way of reform was made possible because of the small size of their units and programs and because of their relatively easy access to political connections both within and outside the university, even to the highest levels of government. It seems quite clear that the larger the institution, the more static things seem to be and the more static things are, the more difficult it is to make changes. The kind of foot dragging and stalling tactics that have successfully perpetuated the status quo of teacher education for generations seem more difficult to loosen up in larger institutions. I am left to wonder how larger institutions can act like smaller institutions are able to act and how it is possible to create smaller autonomous units within larger structures.

The development of a "collaborative ethos" and a felt ownership of the program was essential for the successful facilitation of change. For those centrally involved in the reform endeavours there was a sense that, as one person described it, "This is ours to make; this is ours to break". This feeling of ownership, combined with opportunities to see early results of their work helped to strengthen the commitment of those involved. Also critical to the spirit of the community was some assurance that their efforts were to be taken seriously. As one person put it, "It was key that it was known from the beginning that this was not an experiment but a permanent change, that there was no going back, no opting out".

Communication

Communication seems to be key to successful change. In all cases, the importance of good communication processes was acknowledged and identified as a continuing priority. Communication was better in some institutions than others but

everywhere there was an emphasis placed on the importance of ongoing dialogue. Effective change involves much discussion; transparency of the change process is important so that new people involved can understand the process and reasons for particular decisions made along the way, both of which are especially important for ensuring an understanding of the philosophical underpinnings or foundational qualities of the program.

The main challenge for those institutions with a highly coherent group of faculty is finding time to continue to discuss and develop the program. For other institutions, with varying levels of support and involvement of faculty in the change effort, the challenge is to attend to the recognized need to provide 'safe' places for all people to voice their concerns and communicate their perspectives. It is rarely the case that everyone involved in a change effort fully understands and supports it. Indeed, for some, the changes represent a kind of traumatic life event and the effects of change are profound. For those individuals most resistant to change communication is critical and time and patience essential. People's resistance needs to be understood, appreciated, and respected and their losses acknowledged. It is essential to find ways of honouring individuals' positions and responses in ways that help teacher education move forward. The challenge is to do that and still move forward. What I consistently hear and have reaffirmed is the importance of attending to process.

These efforts, and the people driving them, give us hope. Through them (and other like them) teacher education is slowly but surely finding its place as a respected professional program and scholarly discipline. In many ways the people behind these efforts are revolutionaries and relentless optimists. And yet, their struggles for change are not without tremendous challenges. I take a step now into the shadows to identify and discuss some of the threats to the continuing success and ongoing development of these efforts and the people behind them.

Threats to Change

Change in Leadership

The kind of changes brought about in these institutions have challenged tradition in many ways. Because of the stronghold that tradition has within institutions, these changes are tremendously fragile. New roots have not yet had time to establish and there is a constant danger that, at any time, the changes that have been fought for so hard could be plowed under by any number of strong forces. Because one of the central enablers of change is the unit administrator(s), one of the biggest threats to the continuation of successful change is a change in leadership. As one person commented, "Change in the early stages is incredibly person/leader-dependent. I would be afraid if the leadership changed–if someone came in without deep commitment or vision, someone who could name the stuff but doesn't live it–then we could revert back really quickly". There is a strong sense that the future of the new programs hinges on leadership and the leader's strength of commitment to the change effort.

One of the current challenges in these programs is to move from a stage of initial implementation to sustained and ongoing improvement. To accomplish this requires the stability and security of having the same unit leader or someone with a highly compatible vision and commitment. The need for continuity in leadership and support is also critical at a personal level so that those who have invested so much in the change efforts can reach a level of satisfaction in knowing that a change of administration will not threaten the continuation of the changes underway and that their efforts have not been for naught. Because the changes have been so profound in these programs there is a strong sense that, even with a change in leadership, it would be impossible for the many people who have embraced the changes to revert to old ways.

The prospect of leadership change is omnipresent for many reasons, not the least of which relates to the kind of sustained physical and emotional energy required to lead, facilitate, and support change and the nature of the personal, political, and career costs accrued. It takes courage and stamina to lead change and the risks involved are numerous. There comes a time when these individuals must ask themselves how long they can or want to sustain their efforts and at what costs. It is difficult to know when a leader can or should step aside, how long it will take before sufficient, self-propelling momentum has been generated to move commitment forward; in other words, when it is 'safe' for leadership to change.

The timing of leadership change, either self-motivated change or change induced by various external forces, is perhaps responsible in large part for the perpetuation of the status quo in teacher education. As such, in these programs the ever-present possibility of leadership change is a serious threat.

Sustainability of Energy

As an outsider, it is difficult not to get caught up in the excitement and possibility of what is happening in these institutions. The energy is at once palpable and portentous. The speed at which changes are taking place and the labour and time intensive demands of the change process raise serious questions about the sustainability of the energy invested in these efforts. Massive change carried out by a small number of faculty levies a heavy personal and professional toll. The work of those involved is a balancing act of activities, demands, obligations, commitments, and aspirations and a search for balance between the personal and professional realms of life is pretty much an elusive pursuit. Work and personal (self and family) commitments pull against one another and the threat of burn-out is very real, especially for new faculty.

The energy and enthusiasm that new faculty in particular seem to have for and are prepared to invest in new initiatives is at once a tremendous asset and a serious

concern. A tendency to overextend, to not say "No" to anything, to not question workload and other demands placed on them puts new faculty on the border of exploitation. In cases where faculty complement is comprised of mostly newly hired teacher educators in their first tenure-stream positions and where there are no senior faculty to assume responsibilities for administrative tasks, the demands of tenure review, which usually are at odds with the demands of a change agenda, loom large. The dilemma inherent in this competition for time and energy is clear. It becomes a question of how to simultaneously maintain a commitment to a collective and individual agenda. Time required for the change process is great and distracts from one's personal career development in research and teaching. As one senior faculty member observed, "junior faculty need to play out an individualist agenda until after tenure, then they can be more collaborative". I discuss the relationship between the university reward system and teacher education reform later in the paper.

The speed at which changes are occurring is overwhelming for some, unsettling for others thus suggesting a need for what one called "at least a short period of stability". As one person commented, "Everything comes down to time. Given that time is limited and fixed, how do I best want to spend it"? Pressures to perform as teachers, researchers, scholars, and community members and personal ambitions to "make a difference" leave little time or room for life outside work, especially when those two sets of goals require different but equally demanding ways of working. Self-care is often reduced to luxury and family commitments become a challenge to uphold. The personal and professional sacrifices made, often with considerable associated pain and loss, represent serious threats to the ongoing health and well-being of individuals and, by extension, to the continuation of the change efforts. The question everyone needs to ask is, Is it worth it?

Sustainability of Program Change

Pressures to meet deadlines and to be constantly "under construction", while seen as momentum sustaining, also threaten the ongoing development of programs mainly because of the intensive concentration of energies in program development. Beyond needing to divert attention to other demands, there is also a sense that time is needed to "let the dust settle and assess", to focus on reflection and refinement rather than on expansion into new programmatic areas, to consider deeper issues including differences in perspective among faculty. Related to the issue of communication discussed earlier, there is a pervasive concern across programs that, given the press of time and competing demands, there is a danger that these parts of the development and change process, viewed as central to the sustainability and continuing growth of the programs, will not be given adequate attention.

Lack of time to continue to develop the programs and to integrate research and program development, and lack of adequate resources to sustain the efforts also challenge the sustainability of the reform efforts. One person summed up the situation in this way:

> The new program is a superb program for teacher education. I only wish that we had the resources–time and qualified people–to really put it in place.... At the provincial level and within the university education is underfunded. The program shows all the stresses and strains that go along with that. Everyone is working beyond maximum capacity. We need to live through the mean times with optimism that under better conditions the change will really work and be better.

Faculty and Academic Cultures

Substantive change can reveal the dark side of human nature and academic culture because, as one person observed, "This is not a change in program but a change in culture which involves values conflicts at many levels. What we may be

dealing with is pathos not ethos". This is a poignant and troubling statement perhaps because it reveals a truth that is too painful to acknowledge. Nevertheless, as painful as it may be, the reality is that the very norms and patterns of discourse and behaviour that define how we are in our university institutions threaten the success of attempts at reform. In order to effect substantial changes in teacher education programs and in the work of teacher educators, the culture that supports the status quo must change.

The kinds of changes underway at these institutions require a commitment to a way of working and a set of values that is at odds with cultural traditions of the university. The programs and processes adopted depend on a communitarian ethic that presents a challenge to the isolationist, individualistic culture that is built on expectations of privilege based on particular notions of knowledge and ways of working. A team structure, perceived as necessary for successful change, is particularly difficult to develop within the academy's traditional context.

Within Education there exist opposing cultures–one defined by traditional values of the university and the other reflecting values that are quite contradictory. Those involved in teacher education reform represent a challenge to the traditional value system of the university and a threat to conventional notions of what counts as productive and worthwhile work. What results is a values clash that gets played out in an interpersonal tug of war and a bifurcation within education programs and units. Instead of working toward a compromise which honours both positions, it seems that sides have formed and each is pulling harder and with increasing determination to pull the other down. On one side are those committed to careers of being successful academics through research and publishing and on the other are those willing to self-sacrifice to make something work because they are passionately committed to it. Those who make publishing a priority are criticized for lack of commitment to a common agenda. Those who commit to a common agenda are criticized for not being

'academic enough'. There is a distrust on both sides that it is possible to have a dual commitment. This person captures the essence of the issue:

> There is no time for writing and scholarship. I came here because I wanted to be a scholar but if we end up putting into place a program that takes so much of our time we may just as well be a teacher training institution.

An individualist mentality, defined and promoted by a system that values and rewards isolated work and an individualist agenda, has defined professors' work since universities were established. It is not surprising that a suggestion to reconsider these values and rewards in favour of more collaborative and community-centred work is not openly embraced. To do so, as one person commented, would require "giving up on the notion of becoming famous [through high profile research and publishing] because your effects are local". Lorri Neilsen (2000) writes about the academy as a self-perpetuating cult of celebrity, power, and authority from which it is difficult to break free. Evidence of this is pervasive in teacher education institutions that have a reform agenda. The values that define academic culture are integrally connected to personal values and identity. What is important to individuals plays out in their responses to reform efforts.

Forces of Tradition and Identity

"I love that there isn't a tradition to uphold here. In the rest of the university you always hear, 'Well you know, traditionally...' And it is always with a capital T. Usually that means we are not going to change what we are doing". These words, expressed by a new faculty member heavily involved in program reform in an institution comprised almost entirely of new faculty, taste bitter-sweet. The fact that tradition is viewed as constraining rather than inspiring is unfortunate; on the other hand, with no history of bad practice and no heavy weights of tradition to slow progress, this group of faculty was able to effect dramatic change that was well received both within and outside the university.

In most efforts to reform teacher education tradition, which lives on and is passed on by senior members of the community, is viewed as a force that threatens progress. It could just as easily advance it. For new faculty, especially, it is more efficient to go into a program where there is a history and where there are established procedures and people who know them, and where the wisdom of experience can guide decisions. Unfortunately, this kind of context is more of a romantic ideal than a reality. In instances where there are senior faculty, who could assume certain roles and responsibilities to facilitate change efforts and defray some of the demands placed on new faculty, mainly they and the traditions they represent serve to hinder more than help progress. Rather than using their knowledge and political savvy to move efforts forward, many senior faculty put these strengths to work against change. Many senior faculty seem content with having junior faculty doing the 'change' work so that they can get on with their research and publishing agenda.

Ed Ducharme (1993), in his book, The Lives of Teacher Educators, makes the observation that the new generation of teacher educators will inherit the professoriate. I was reminded of this comment by a senior faculty member who expressed the following view of the role of senior faculty in change efforts:

> We need to allow the younger faculty to create what they will inherit not what we want them to inherit. We have to be thinking about their next twenty years not ours; we won't be here. Many senior professors who chose retirement recognized the need for the younger generation to make change but chose not to be involved. Those who chose to stay need to let go of their own agenda for the remainder of their time here.

This comment also reminded me of Erik Erikson's concept of generativity–a commitment by mature individuals to helping shape the next generation. In Education departments and faculties, for the most part, there seems to be a notable absence of

individuals with this kind of commitment. In Aboriginal communities, elders perform such a role.

According to Hamilton and Sinclair (1991, cited in Paterson & Hart-Wasekeesikaw, 1994), Aboriginal elders assist community members to learn their traditions and culture and to maintain health and well-being. Colorado (1988, cited in Paterson & Hart-Wasekeesikaw, 1994) states that people who qualify as elders have the capacity to develop close, meaningful relationships and to demonstrate compassion, insight, and empathy and they assume their roles with deep humility. While the traditions and culture of the academy are being passed down through senior faculty, it is doubtful that the well-being of the younger community members is the motivation for such teaching. And, for the most part, it seems that senior faculty in Education communities do not qualify as elders.

Instead of change efforts being fostered by nurturance, protection, and care in many instances they have been burdened by pain, suffering, and loss. Although, as one person commented, "reconceptualization should be second nature to us, when it is ourselves we are reconceptualizing it is a different story". The culture of the university is such that the boundary between one's career identity and sense of personal worth is very blurred. In many instances the kind of deep change undertaken strikes at the heart of a complex personal-professional identity. There is a sense that a shift away from specialized and discipline-based knowledge and toward teacher education as an interdisciplinary and integrated agenda reflects a devaluing of individuals who hold that knowledge and who have developed successful careers around it. "The kind of identity that has grown up in the university is of a person who can accrue awards and gather people and build empires and defend them" and this kind of identity is threatened with a shift in values away from an individualistic agenda toward a more collaborative, community-centred one.

Changing methods and programs may mean changing one's identity. For some, the costs to do so may be too great and they may need to seek appropriate recognition elsewhere. It may be important for the life of new programs to help those individuals opt out of changes that seem far too threatening. Their involvement may do more harm than good.

Regardless of position or perspective, everyone's pain is legitimate, real. There is no way around it, change is hard, even traumatic for some, and the issues are incredibly complex. When we talk about how difficult change is we typically talk in terms denoting objectification and confrontation. We talk about: barriers, resistance, obstacles, facilitating and constraining structures, and about how to face or remove or overcome them. What we do not do well is honour those responses of pain, loss, threat, or fear for what they are. Nor do we honour their motivations–motivations rooted in issues of identity (and how that might be threatened) and investment (sometimes of entire careers).

A faculty member who has spent an entire career developing an identity and reputation in an education field that is only tangentially related to teacher education is likely to respond in less than productive, sometimes even hurtful, ways when 'asked' to invest a considerable portion of his time and energy to the reforming of teacher education and, by extension, to the reforming of his scholarly identity. A new faculty member, with twenty years experience in schools, hired because of her commitment to teaching and teacher education and to finding better ways to prepare teachers, may want to put her heart and soul into making a difference in schools. While most of her time is spent doing 'invisible labour' associated with program development and relationship building in the field, leaving little time and energy left over for the work that really counts in the university, this work represents her developing identity. We need to find ways of honouring individuals' positions and responses in ways that help individuals and programs move forward in healthy and productive ways.

Reward System

The dual mandate of teacher educators' work that requires them to serve both the academy and the profession keeps their gaze focused on the fulcrum of their lives striving for balance. Time spent on teaching and field development activities must be kept in check so that sufficient time is available for research and writing. Decisions about the kind of research to engage in, where to publish, and for what purposes must take into account the different sets of values that define the profession and the academy. Aspirations and commitments to work collaboratively must be carefully monitored (even in spite of rhetoric that suggests otherwise) so as to live up to the university's standards of individualism, especially for purposes of tenure and promotion. A divergence in research interests must be curtailed in order to establish a specialized and unique program of research. Attitudes, values, and practices cannot be overly challenging of the status quo upon which all structures, policies, and norms are based.

The problem for most teacher educators, especially those committed to change in teacher education, is that no matter how hard they try the scales are impossible to balance because the weights are uneven to begin with. According to the values and standards of the university teaching, service, professional and community development, and other activities that have mainly local or personal implications and which demand inordinate time and energy commitments do not carry much weight. The heavy weights from the university's perspective are those activities which result in intellectual and financial prestige and international acclaim. For most teacher educators, it seems, any balance that is possible to achieve is always imperfect.

Those involved in reform efforts continue to devote time and energy to work that does not count much toward tenure and continue to be rewarded by low merit increments and the knowledge that colleagues who, in many cases, explicitly oppose their work, continue to receive accolades from the university. Pretenured faculty are at

greatest risk for their involvement in change efforts because of the ever-present threat of not obtaining tenure. Change leaders are aware of the tension it creates. They acknowledge that the key people instrumental in facilitating change should be placing energies elsewhere if they are to measure up to the university standards of review. Concerted efforts of various kinds are being made by administrators to challenge the reward system and to find "legitimate" ways to recognise change efforts, for example, by opening up the reward system to make room for different kinds of scholarship and by thinking creatively about how to name particular kinds of activities. At the same time, however, there is an acknowledgement that such protection may only be short term and can only go so far. Time devoted to work that does not show up or show well enough on Curriculum Vitae is time taken away from activities that may be more advancing of an academic career beyond the current university context.

The reward system or, rather, the standards and values underpinning it, which have shaped and defined normative practices in the academy, stands as a menacing threat to reform. If teacher education reform is to succeed, a serious re-examination of the current reward system is necessary. Such an examination would involve not just a superficial scanning and modification of standards or expectations but rather a serious and extensive institutional self-examination of values, goals, policies, and practices, including a reconsideration of the relationship between scholarship and scholarly program development. Such an exercise and process needs to be followed by a commitment to a reform of the reward system that is articulated and upheld. Without such a re-examination and public commitment to realign institutional structures to match and support espoused commitments to reform it is likely that the adage "the more things change superficially, the more they stay fundamentally the same" will continue to describe the state of teacher education in universities. If only superficial change seems possible, then perhaps it is time to reconsider the place of Education in universities.

Believing in Goodness

To conclude I return to the notion of goodness and its importance as a lens through which to view teacher education reform. Sarah Lawrence-Lightfoot (1997) asserts that the magnification of what is wrong neglects promise and potential, can lead to cynicism and inaction, and can move into victim blaming that creates a static situation for individuals and institutions. In contrast, "The counterpoint and contradiction of strength and vulnerability, virtue and evil (and how people, cultures, and organizations negotiate those extremes in an effort to establish the precarious balance between them) are central to the expressions of goodness" (p. 9).

In considering teacher education reform efforts, it is easy to dwell in the shadows of teacher education institutions because there are so many dark nooks and crannies in which to settle. But there are also spots of brilliance, life-giving energy, and hope. Indeed, it is these qualities that fuel the passions and commitments of those instrumental in reform efforts. On an unusually warm Fall day, with the brilliance of an Autumn sun streaming in the office window bathing us and our conversation in the warmth and glow of its energy, it is hard to believe that anything but goodness will come of the many sincere efforts to make teacher education programs and institutions better places for teachers and teacher educators.

References

Blackwell, P. (1996). Reform under adversity. Teacher Education Quarterly, 23(1), 19-26.

Bush, R.N. (1987). Teacher education reform: Lessons from the past half century. Journal of Teacher Education, 38(3), 13-19.

Clark, S.M. (1993). Higher education and school reform. The Review of Higher Education, 17(1), 1-20.

Cole, A. L. (1999). An overview and analysis of teacher education reform in Anglophone Canada. Paper presented at the Canadian Society for the Study of Education Annual Conference, Sherbrooke, Quebec.

Cole, A. L. (2000). Teacher educators and teacher education reform: Individual commitments, institutional realities. Canadian Journal of Education, 24(3).

Cole, A. L., & Knowles, J. G. (forthcoming). Researching lives in context: Examples, methods, and issues in life history research. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Cole, A. L., Knowles, J. G., brown, b., & Buttignol, M. (1999). Living in paradox: A Multi-media representation of teacher educators' lives in context. A three-part multi-media installation exhibited at the Canadian Society for the Study of Education Annual Conference, Sherbrooke, Quebec.

Colorado, P. (1988). Bridging native and western science. Convergence, 21, 55-59.

Cornbleth, C. (1986). Ritual and rationality in teacher education reform. Educational Researcher, 15(4), 5-14.

Cuban, L. (1990). Reforming again, again, and again. Educational Researcher, 19(1), 3-13.

Ducharme, E. R. (1993) The lives of teacher educators. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. with Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). The new meaning of educational change (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Goodson, I.F. (1995). The story so far: Personal knowledge and the political. In J. Hatch & R. Wisniewski (Eds.) Life history and narrative (pp. 89-98). London, UK: The Falmer Press.

Hamilton, A. C., & Sinclair, C. M. (1991) The justice system and Aboriginal people: Report of the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry of Manitoba. Winnipeg, MB: Queen's Printer.

Holmes Group (1995). Tomorrow's schools of education. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Kerr, C. (1986). In Cerych, L., & Sabatier, P. Great expectations and mixed performance: The implementation of higher education reform in Europe. Stoke-on-Trent, UK: European Institute of Education and Social Policy.

Kettlewell, J. (1996). The Miami (Ohio) University Story. Teacher Education Quarterly, 23(1), 27-33.

Lawrence-Lightfoot, S. & Hoffman Davis, J. (1997) The art and science of portraiture. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Neilsen, L. (2000). Academy performances, academy rewards: Cautionary tales Teacher Education Quarterly, 27(2), 163-170.

Paterson, B. & Hart-Wasekeesikaw (1994). Mentoring women in higher education. College Teaching, 42(2), 72-77.

Portman, P.A. (1993). Barriers to change in teacher education. Action in Teacher Education, 15(1), 14-21.

Sarason, 1990). The predictable failure of educational reform. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.